

Public Document Pack

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

Elmbridge Borough Council

Individual Cabinet Member Decision Making - Planning Services

Report of decisions taken on 27 February 2018

Present:

Mrs. K. Randolph (Portfolio Holder for Planning Services)

Also present:

B. Fairbank, S.J. Selleck, Mrs. T. Shipley and Mrs. J.R. Turner

5/17 Declarations of Interest

In respect of agenda item 2 'Draft Response to the new London Plan Consultation' (Minute No. 6/17 refers), whilst not a disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct, B. Fairbank wished that it be noted that he was a member of the Long Ditton Residents Association which had submitted written representations.

In respect of agenda item 2 'Draft Response to the new London Plan Consultation' (Minute No. 6/17 refers), whilst not a disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct, Mrs. J.R. Turner wished that it be noted that she was a member of the Hinchley Wood Residents Association.

In respect of agenda item 2 'Draft Response to the new London Plan Consultation' (Minute No. 6/17 refers), whilst not a disclosable interest under the Code of Conduct, Mrs. T. Shipley wished that it be noted that she was one of the Ward Councillors for Hinchley Wood and Weston Green.

Matters of Report

6/17 Draft Response to the New London Plan Consultation

(Link to Council Priorities: P1, P4)

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services considered a report that set out the Council's draft response to the Mayor of London's draft new London Plan public consultation.

The last London Plan (Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP)), that had been adopted in 2015, was currently under review to take account of changes in national policy and to address several strategic issues raised during the Examination in Public (EiP) which had included the failure to meet identified housing needs.

The Portfolio Holder noted that the new London Plan would set out the overarching planning framework for those local authorities within the Capital, and provide the policies within which each London Authority must confirm when

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

preparing their own individual Local Plans. The Plan would provide a strategic plan for development for the next 25 years from 2019 to 2041.

The draft new London Plan was an entirely new Plan and once adopted would replace all previous versions including any modifications and alterations. Whilst the draft Plan differed significantly from the current London Plan, it introduced a new concept of 'Good Growth', which the Mayor defined as growth that was socially and economically inclusive and environmentally sustainable (cross-cutting policies).

With regard to the key issues for Elmbridge, the significant issue that had emerged from the new draft London Plan was housing provision. Whilst the new draft London Plan sought to meet the housing needs within the Greater London Authority, it was also seeking to increase the delivery of new homes within Outer London.

During consideration of the report, the Head of Planning Services took the opportunity to update the Portfolio Holder that the Council's draft response to the public consultation had been considered and discussed at the recent Local Plan Working Group (LPWG) meeting. As a result of the comments made at the LPWG meeting and in light of comments received from community groups, the Council's draft response had been redrafted. The amendments sought to address any misunderstanding and provide greater clarification as to the Council's position on Green Belt. In order to convey more clearly and concisely the Council's response, the following had been amended:

- on the first page of the draft response, the fifth bullet point had been amended to read "the Metropolitan Green Belt"; and
- the section 'A strategic review of the Metropolitan Green Belt' had been replaced with the following text:

'The Metropolitan Green Belt

The Council notes that throughout the draft London Plan there is the presumption in favour of building on previously developed land and that the continued protection of Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and other open land is strongly advocated (Policies H1, G2 and G3). However, the Mayor's approach does not recognise that in practice that several outer London Boroughs and local authorities on the London-Fringe covered by the wider Metropolitan Green Belt are already undertaking reviews of the Green Belt, in accordance with National Planning Guidance and the requirement to meet identified objectively assessed need.

The Council is concerned that without the benefit of a wider-strategic approach, local authorities within the South East are applying various approaches and methodologies to Green Belt reviews. This ad hoc approach is leading to inconsistent proposals for Green Belt release / protection and piecemeal release which may undermine the integrity of the

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

wider Metropolitan Green Belt and prevent development taking place in the most sustainable locations away from Green Belt areas where its integrity is most vulnerable.

The Council is also seeking clarification on how Crossrail 2 South, the Kingston Opportunity Area (Policy SD1) and the proposed 9,000 homes in Chessington will be delivered. It is not clear how these can be achieved without potential releases of Green Belt land. Given the proximity of Chessington to our Borough Boundary it is necessary to consider the Mayor's longer-term plans for this part of London as part of London as part of the preparation of our current Local Plan.'

The Head of Planning Services reported that the redrafted section in respect of the Metropolitan Green Belt was now considered to be more succinct and provided a clearer argument. She further commented that the Council's intention had not been to request the Mayor of London to undertake a Strategic Review of Elmbridge's Green Belt. Whilst the Council fully supported the protection of Green Belt, there was a need to acknowledge that a number of London Boroughs were already undertaking Strategic Reviews. The Council did not support piecemeal erosion of Green Belt and in this regard there was a need to not undermine the Council's area of Metropolitan Green Belt.

During consideration of the item, the Portfolio Holder invited Councillor Mrs. J.R. Turner to comment on the Council's draft response. In order to fully understand the cross-boundary strategic planning issues that the draft London Plan could have on the Borough, Councillor Mrs. Turner asked whether officers could provide a Member Briefing for all Members. In this regard, the Head of Planning Services confirmed that an all Member Briefing had been arranged for 5 p.m. on Wednesday 7 March 2018 which would provide greater clarification with regard to the draft London Plan and the Council's draft response.

The Portfolio Holder then invited Councillor S.J. Selleck to comment and he requested that the invitation to the Member briefing be sent out to all Members as soon as possible with the redrafted Council's response to the draft Local Plan attached, which officers agreed to undertake.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services thanked the officers for all the work undertaken in preparing the Council's response to the draft new London Plan and whilst supporting the redrafted version, acknowledged that the introduction and conclusion of the response would also need to be amended. Subject to this being undertaken, the Portfolio Holder

Resolved that the Council's response to the draft new London Plan, as amended and as set out at Appendix A to these minutes, be approved and submitted to the Mayor of London by 2 March 2018.

These Minutes should be referred to in conjunction with the Minutes of the subsequent meeting of the Council, where they are presented; and for completeness to the next relevant meeting when the Minutes are adopted.

7/17 Elmbridge BC Authority Monitoring Report 2016/17

(Link to Council Priorities: P3)

Under the Government's Local Plan Regulations, there was a requirement to formally produce an Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) and in this regard, the Portfolio Holder for Planning Services considered a report that sought approval to formally publish the AMR.

The Portfolio Holder noted that, whilst all authorities were still required to produce a monitoring report each year, there was no requirement for them to submit the report to the Secretary of State, or report against a fixed set of centrally agreed indicators. Instead, the AMR was required to set out performance against locally important objectives as set out in the Core Strategy to enable better local scrutiny of the impacts of local policies on planning and development.

This was the Council's thirteenth AMR and covered the period 1 April 2016 to 31 March 2017. The AMR assessed the preparation of emerging Local Plan documents and represented the fifth full monitoring year since the Core Strategy had been adopted in 2011. The report had been written taking full account of government guidance and met these requirements in full providing a clear picture of performance against the Council's objectives.

In particular, in respect of housing, the Portfolio Holder noted that the Council was unable to demonstrate a 5-year housing land supply given that only 267 net dwellings had been completed in the period of this AMR.

The Portfolio Holder was pleased to note that the implementation and use of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funds had been very successful as the Council had collected more than double its £2,000,000 target. This showed that the Levy was both deliverable and viable.

During consideration of the item, the Portfolio Holder invited Councillor S.J. Selleck to comment on the AMR. Whilst acknowledging that the AMR was for 2016/17, Councillor Selleck asked whether the Council was required to publish the document given that the content was significantly out of date. Whilst the AMR should have been published in December 2017, the Planning Policy Manager advised that due to resourcing issues this had not been possible. However, even though the content was now out of date, the Council was still obliged to publish the AMR. In this regard, it was suggested that an explanation be provided as to why the publication of the AMR for 2016/17 had been delayed.

The Portfolio Holder for Planning Services welcomed the interesting and comprehensive Council's Authority Monitoring Report for 2016/17 and thanked the officers for all the work undertaken in collecting the required data. On consideration of the report and specifically with regard to the Council not meeting its Local Plan target for the delivery of 77 affordable homes per

This page is intentionally left blank



Sadiq Khan, Mayor of London
New London Plan
GLA City Hall
Post Point 18
FREEPOST RTJC-XBZZ-GJKZ
LONDON SE1 2AA

contact: Suzanne Parkes
Planning Policy Manager
direct line: 01372 474810
e-mail: sparkes@elmbridge.gov.uk
my ref: LondonPlan2018
your ref:

1st March 2018

SENT VIA EMAIL

Dear Mr Mayor,

Elmbridge Borough Council Response to the Draft London Plan 2019 – 2041 Consultation

Elmbridge Borough Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the draft London Plan 2019 – 2041. As a neighbouring borough, the Council is particularly interested in those cross-boundary strategic planning issues that could have implications for the Borough and for its own Local Plan preparation as well as how the benefits of growth and development in London could be shared with other local authorities.

Having reviewed the new London Plan, the Council would like to convey its general support for the draft plan and policies. The Council welcomes the concept of 'Good Growth', which the Mayor defines as growth that is socially and economically inclusive and environmentally sustainable (cross-cutting policies). Responding to the consultation in further detail, the Council has provided comments under the following headings:

- calculating housing need and taking account of the Government's proposed standard methodology;
- the identification of sub-housing market areas in London and how individual targets within London have been set;
- the delivery of the housing target;
- the type of homes to be delivered;
- the Metropolitan Green Belt; and
- duty to co-operate regarding cross boundary and strategic issues relating to the London Plan.

Calculating housing need

The draft London Plan sets out an overall target of 66,000 new homes every year for a 10-year period between 2019/20 and 2028/29. The Council welcomes the increase proposed from the current target of 49,000 as set out in the Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) (2015).

Regarding the Government's proposed standard methodology for calculating the number of homes required (Planning for the right homes in the right places, September 2017), the Council is aware that if this were applied circ. 72,000 homes should be provided across London per annum. The Council understands that the GLA's figure of 66,000 new homes is based on its own projections which differ slightly due to the longer time periods and trends data used by the GLA. It is also understood that this approach has been used to inform the preparation of previous London Plans (and amendments) and agreed at successive Examinations in Public.

Based on the above, the Council supports the identified housing need for London of 66,000 homes per annum. Nevertheless, in doing so the Council calls on the Mayor to support other Local Planning Authorities (LPA) outside of London should they also choose to deviate from the proposed standard methodology, using the same approach as the GLA as part of their own individual Local Plan preparation.

Sub- market housing areas and the setting of individual targets within London

The Council appreciates the acknowledgement of the series of complex and interlinked sub-markets (paragraph 4.1.2 of the draft London Plan) and the opportunity that exists within London to plan strategically, setting individual targets within London based on opportunities for development and the sustainability of locations.

The GLA's policy push to expect Outer London Authorities to deliver an increase in housing is also generally welcomed. This is a shift from previous London Plans that sought a continued reliance on Inner London to deliver the homes Londoners require. As set out in the Council's response to the FALP, this has been a key issue for those authorities outside of London and particularly in those areas on the fringe of the GLA area, as any under-delivery has tended to place increased pressure on housing delivery in our areas.

The realistic nature of whether such housing targets can be achieved

As set out above, the Council welcomes the proposed increase in housing targets across London and the bridging of the gap of un-met housing need. In supporting this approach, the Council acknowledges that to deliver the increase in homes, a shift in delivery will be required for example, increased densities and the delivery of more smaller sites. The Council also understands that this approach will require increased funding and investment from Government particularly in terms of infrastructure.

In supporting the call for increased funding and investment into London, the Council requests that the Mayor considers how any improvements can benefit authorities outside London, acknowledging that infrastructure is a key-cross boundary issue.

The types of homes to be delivered

It is clear to the Council that to increase housing delivery within London, the draft Plan is pushing to increase densities on most sites, principally those in key locations such as transport hubs and in town centres. This is mostly evident through the introduction of a small sites target for each London Borough.

Whilst the concept of optimising densities is supported in principle, the Council is concerned as to the type of homes that will be delivered because of this approach. The focus on higher density development across London and, within the Opportunity Areas in particular, is likely to only yield high-rise development of 1 and 2-bedroom units. The London Strategic Housing

Market Assessment (2017) identifies smaller units as the predominate need however, 29% of London's housing need does consist of family sized homes (3 and 4+ bedrooms).

By continuing to focus on increasing densities and thus the delivery of predominately smaller units, this approach fails to provide for the varying types of homes required. Inevitably this will lead to increased out-ward migration from London into neighbouring boroughs and districts putting significant pressure not only on their need to deliver more homes but also the supporting infrastructure required to support such growth. This includes schools, public services such as Health Centre and, in particular road and railway infrastructure for which, there is already some deficit.

The Metropolitan Green Belt

The Council notes that throughout the draft London Plan there is the presumption in favour of building on previously developed land and that the continued protection of Green Belt, Metropolitan Open Land (MOL) and other open land is strongly advocated (Policies H1, G2 and G3). However, the Mayor's approach does not recognise that in practice that several outer London Boroughs and local authorities on the London-Fringe covered by the wider Metropolitan Green Belt are already undertaking reviews of the Green Belt, in accordance with National Planning Guidance and the requirement to meet identified objectively assessed need.

The Council is concerned that without the benefit of a wider-strategic approach, local authorities within the South East are applying various approaches and methodologies to Green Belt reviews. This ad hoc approach is leading to inconsistent proposals for Green Belt release/protection and piecemeal release which may undermine the integrity of the wider Metropolitan Green Belt and prevent development taking place in the most sustainable locations away from Green Belt areas where its integrity is most vulnerable.

The Council is also seeking clarification on how Crossrail 2 South, the Kingston Opportunity Area (Policy SD1) and the proposed 9,000 homes in Chessington will be delivered. It is not clear how these can be achieved without potential releases of Green Belt land. Given the proximity of Chessington to our Borough Boundary it is necessary to consider the Mayor's longer-term plans for this part of London as part of the preparation of our current Local Plan.

Duty to Co-operate

Throughout the original London Plan and the FALP, the need for a partnership approach to plan-making and addressing the key strategic issues, both by the Mayor and individual London Boroughs, was clearly stated. This has continued through to the new draft London Plan with a specific policy focusing on collaboration in the Wider South East (Policy SD2).

As a local authority immediately adjoining the Greater London boundary, it is extremely important that this Council continues to be informed of the continued development of the new London Plan. In particular, the proposed Kingston Opportunity Area.

However, relating back to the Mayor's own comments regarding the series of complex and interlinked sub-markets, the Mayor must acknowledge and recognise the findings of the Kingston & North-East Surrey SHMA (2016). That is that Kingston-upon-Thames falls within a sub-housing market area that includes the Surrey Authorities of Elmbridge Borough Council, Epsom & Ewell Borough Council and Mole Valley District Council.

On this basis, the Council strongly disagrees with the Mayor's statement that because of London's ability to plan strategically, boroughs are not required to carry out their own housing

needs assessment but must plan for, and seek to deliver, the housing targets in the Plan. This ignores the biggest cross-boundary strategic planning issue that there is.

Kingston is part of the Kingston and North-East Surrey HMA and the Mayor is required to acknowledge this under the duty to cooperate. It is therefore strongly suggested that any housing delivery over the housing target for Kingston, as set out in the London Plan, is equally apportioned to London and the remainder of the Kingston & North-East Surrey HMA. This would also include a proportion of any housing delivery provided through the Opportunity Areas. Such an approach would recognise the linkages between areas, emphasising and truly embracing the duty. It is considered that the Planning Inspector would recognise the benefits of such an approach and the logic and pragmatism behind it and would expect this to be fully explored through a Statement of Common Ground with the HMA authorities.

Prior to any further deliberations on housing targets and amended policies following this consultation, the Council kindly requests an opportunity to discuss this proposal.

Conclusions

Whilst the Council welcomes the proposed increase in the London housing target, concern remain as to the type of homes that will be delivered and the pressure this could place on authorities outside of London to provide more family homes. The Council would also welcome clarification on the Mayor's longer-term approach to the wider Metropolitan Green Belt beyond the London Plan period (2028/29).

We look forward to any further iterations of the plan and would welcome further co-operation regarding the proposals for Kingston in terms of the Opportunity Area and also the mutual benefits of any over delivery in their housing target.

Please contact our Head of Planning Services Kim Tagliarini (01372 474702 / KTagliarini@elmbridge.gov.uk) if you have any queries on the points raised in our response.

Yours sincerely

Cllr Mrs Karen Randolph
Portfolio Holder for Planning Services